UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/691,958	10/23/2003	Michael S. South	PHA 4161.36 (3201/1A)	3471
321 SENNIGER PO	7590 04/04/2007 OWERS		EXAMINER	
ONE METROPOLITAN SQUARE			TUCKER,	ACHARY C
16TH FLOOR ST LOUIS, MO 63102		·	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
,			1624	
				<u></u>
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/04/2007	ELECTRONIC

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

uspatents@senniger.com

Application No. Applicant(s) SOUTH ET AL. 10/691,958 Notice of Abandonment Examiner **Art Unit** Zachary C. Tucker 1624 -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address--This application is abandoned in view of: 1. Applicant's failure to timely file a proper reply to the Office letter mailed on 18 September 2006. (a) A reply was received on \_\_\_\_\_ (with a Certificate of Mailing or Transmission dated \_\_\_\_\_), which is after the expiration of the period for reply (including a total extension of time of \_\_\_\_\_ month(s)) which expired on \_\_\_\_\_ (b) A proposed reply was received on \_\_\_\_\_, but it does not constitute a proper reply under 37 CFR 1.113 (a) to the final rejection. (A proper reply under 37 CFR 1.113 to a final rejection consists only of: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114). but it does not constitute a proper reply, or a bona fide attempt at a proper reply, to the non-(c) A reply was received on \_ final rejection. See 37 CFR 1.85(a) and 1.111. (See explanation in box 7 below). (d) No reply has been received. 2. Applicant's failure to timely pay the required issue fee and publication fee, if applicable, within the statutory period of three months from the mailing date of the Notice of Allowance (PTOL-85). (a) The issue fee and publication fee, if applicable, was received on \_\_\_\_\_ (with a Certificate of Mailing or Transmission dated ), which is after the expiration of the statutory period for payment of the issue fee (and publication fee) set in the Notice of Allowance (PTOL-85). (b) The submitted fee of \$\_\_\_\_ is insufficient. A balance of \$\_\_\_\_ is due. The issue fee required by 37 CFR 1.18 is \$ . The publication fee, if required by 37 CFR 1.18(d), is \$\_\_\_\_\_. (c) The issue fee and publication fee, if applicable, has not been received. 3. Applicant's failure to timely file corrected drawings as required by, and within the three-month period set in, the Notice of Allowability (PTO-37). (a) Proposed corrected drawings were received on \_\_\_\_\_ (with a Certificate of Mailing or Transmission dated \_\_\_\_\_), which is after the expiration of the period for reply. (b) No corrected drawings have been received. 4. The letter of express abandonment which is signed by the attorney or agent of record, the assignee of the entire interest, or all of the applicants. 5. The letter of express abandonment which is signed by an attorney or agent (acting in a representative capacity under 37 CFR 1.34(a)) upon the filing of a continuing application. 6. The decision by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interference rendered on \_\_\_\_\_ and because the period for seeking court review of the decision has expired and there are no allowed claims. 7. The reason(s) below: Because over six months had passed since the Requirement for Restriction mailed 18 September 2006 was issued. the examiner contacted applicants' counsel, Steve Eck of Pfizer, Inc. to ask if any resposne to the Office action had been submitted. Mr. Eck indicated that the failure to reply was intentional, and that the case should be abandoned.

ZACHARY C. TUCKER PRIMARY EXAMINER

Petitions to revive under 37 CFR 1.137(a) or (b), or requests to withdraw the holding of abandonment under 37 CFR 1.181, should be promptly filed to minimize any negative effects on patent term.